

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/750,559	12/31/2003	Michael J. Mills	75622P007001	5690
22503 75	590 03/20/2006		EXAMINER	
DAVIS & ASSOCIATES			VON BUHR, MARIA N	
P.O. BOX 1093 DRIPPING SPRINGS, TX 78620			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2125	
			DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/750,559	MILLS, MICHAEL J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Maria N. Von Buhr	2125			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply						
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES IN THE MAILING THE MAI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 December 2003 and 14 July 2004</u> .					
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 December 2003</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Perce No (NVMell Pate)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040714. Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040714. Paper No(s)/Mail Date Paper No(s)/Mail Date —						

Application/Control Number: 10/750,559

Page 2

Art Unit: 2125

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.
- 2. Examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's information disclosure statement, received 14 July 2004, with accompanying reference copies. This submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR \$1.97. Accordingly, it has been taken into consideration for this Office action.
- 3. Examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's formal drawings. These drawings are not acceptable.
- 4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "BORSCHT functions" of claim 25 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
- 5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR §1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR §1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by Examiner, Applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 6. The non-statutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute), so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321(c) or §1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR §3.73(b).

7. Claims 1, 11 and 24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claim 19 of co-pending U.S. Application Serial No. 10/750,415 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced co-pending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that co-pending application since the referenced co-pending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claim 19 of U.S. Application Serial No. 10/750,415 contains every element of claims 1, 11 and 24 of the instant application and as such anticipate claims 1, 11 and 24 of the instant application.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why Applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other co-pending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP §804.

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Also, the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Although the instant specification repeatedly refers to "BORSCHT functions," in general, no such functions are actually disclosed and/or

taught. Accordingly, the claimed subject matter is not supported by the instant specification in a manner which would enable one having ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.

- 11. Claims 2-5, 12-15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In these claims, there is no clear nexus between the introduced limitation and body of the parent claims. As per claims 2-5 and 12-15, it is unclear how the "identifying" of various characteristics, when the result of such identification is not claimed as being utilized in any way, further limits the functioning/structure of the parent claims. As per claim 25, there is no relationship between the introduced means and the operation of the parent claim. Therefore, it is unclear what the metes and bounds are.
- 12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by Applicant for a patent.
- 13. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Ito et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212916), which disclose "a semiconductor integrated circuit that hardly causes an unnecessary operation time for variable control over an operating frequency and an internal power supply voltage. A CPU specifies an operational clock signal frequency to a clock generation circuit and an internal power supply voltage to a power supply circuit. The power supply circuit comprises a voltage regulator and a determination circuit to determine a transition state to a specified internal power supply voltage. The CPU uses a first signal to notify which time point the power supply voltage variable control start to the power supply circuit. The power supply circuit returns a second signal to the CPU to notify at which time point the power supply voltage variable control terminated. Based on handshaking between the first and second signals, the power supply voltage variable control hardly causes an unnecessary operation time for variable control over the operating frequency and the internal power supply voltage for saving power consumptions" (the abstract). In other words, Ito et al. teach controlling the transition of a power supply from one value to another value in response to control parameters, including an operational state of a load (see, at least, paragraphs 1-3 and 10-15).

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212916), as applied to claim 24 above, further in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent NO. 5, 854,839).

Although Ito et al. teach Applicant's invention substantially as instantly claimed, Ito et al. do not provide any teachings concerning BORSCHT functions. In this regard, Chen et al. teach such functions in the context of a line circuit environment with variable power supply (see, at least, the abstract). It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the instant invention was made, to utilize such functions in the system of Ito et al., to implement the disclosed variable power control, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

- 16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Applicant is advised to carefully review the cited art, as evidence of the state of the art, in preparation for responding to this Office action.
- 17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria N. Von Buhr whose telephone number is 571-272-3755. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maria N. Von Buhr Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2125